DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 332 334 EA 022 989

AUTHOR Goldman, Paul; And Others
TITLE Administrative Facilitation and Site-Based School Reform Projects.
PUB DATE Apr 91
NOTE 32p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Chicago, IL, April 3-7, 1991).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrative Organization; Administrator Role; Elementary Secondary Education; Leadership Qualities; *Organizational Effectiveness; *Participative Decision Making; Power Structure; Principals; *School Based Management; *School Restructuring; Teacher Administrator Relationship; Teacher Influence; *Teacher Participation
IDENTIFIERS *Oregon

ABSTRACT

Preliminary findings of a study that matched the theoretical concept of facilitative power with the activities of principals and teachers involved in site-based management are presented in this paper. Purposes of the study included: (1) the development of more precise definitions of the concepts of restructuring and site-based management; (2) a description of the actual restructuring processes within schools; (3) and an exploration of changes in the uses of power and how that use of power affects the attitudes and behaviors of teachers and administrators. Methodology involved document analysis of 51 grant proposals submitted by Oregon schools for inclusion in the state's "2020 School Improvement and Professional Development" program for the 1990-91 school year. Interviews were conducted with the principals and at least one site team teacher of 16 of the schools. Findings indicate that lack of a clear definition of "restructuring" did not prevent action. Successful change is possible in situations characterized by a ready staff, supportive principal, shared vision, and minimum of bureaucratic interference. A major factor for success is that reform is real to the people implementing it. Finally, the concept of facilitative power is useful for describing change strategies based on voluntary independent activities. A copy of the questionnaire is included in the appendix. (42 references) (LMI)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED332334

Administrative Facilitation and Site-Based School Reform Projects

Paul Goldman, Diane M. Dunlap, and David T. Conley
Division of Educational Policy and Management
University of Oregon Eugene, OR 97405-1215
(503) 346- 5077 FAX (503) 346-5174

Paper presented at the annual meeting of the
American Educational Research Association,
April 4-8, 1991, Chicago, Illinois

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

P. Goldman

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

EA 022 989

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Administrative Facilitation and Site-Based School Reform Projects

Paul Goldman, Diane M. Dunlap, and David T. Conley
Division of Educational Policy and Management
University of Oregon Eugene, OR 97405-1215
(503) 346- 5077 FAX (503) 346-5174

Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, April 4-8, 1991, Chicago, Illinois

Introduction

We report here preliminary findings of a study that matched the theoretical concept of facilitative power with the activities of principals and teachers exploring site-based management. We have attempted to (1) define more precisely the concepts of restructuring and site-based management, as a prelude to (2) describing what actually occurs in schools that are actively engaged in significant restructuring and or site-based school reform projects; and (3) explore changes in how power is actually exercised in schools that are restructuring and how that exercise of power may affect the attitudes, role-definitions, and behaviors of administrators and teachers. We discuss these concepts in the context of Oregon's "2020 School Improvement and Professional Development" program. This legislatively-initiatiated program currently gives 97 schools funding to develop school improvement plans initiated and administered by teacher-led site committees.

Restructuring and site- based management have become the most recent clarion calls for educational reformers. These themes of reform are driven by a host of factors, including: external pressure for education to adapt and incorporate current business practices (Kearns 1988, Kearns & Doyle 1988); wholesale changes in national and international economic systems (Misahiko 1990; Shane 1989; Mandel and Bernstein 1990); inadequacies of current social/political institutions (Liontis 1990); emerging demographic trends that suggest changes in the makeup of American society (Cetron et. al 1988; Hodgkinson 1988); the rapid development of information processing technologies (Levinson1990); and internal pressures to expand and clarify the roles of educational professionals (Devaney 1987; Little, in press).

Conley (1991: 2) suggests that these reform themes are played out in public schools in a complex manner. Restructuring is "complex, multidimensional, and at times contradictory. It involves discussion, planning, programs and structures." He defines restructuring as *"activities that change fundamental assumptions, practices and relationships, both within the organization, and between the organization and the outside world in ways that lead to improved student learning outcomes"* (Conley, 1991: 19; emphasis added). Specifically, restructuring may include (1) changing the core technology of schools, which incorporates what is taught, how, and to whom; (2) changing the occupational conditions of teaching, increasing if possible both professionalism and accountability; (3) changing the school's authority

ED 028 989

and decision-making structures and processes; and (4) changing the relationship between schools and their staffs on the one hand, and their clients and communities on the other (David, 1989; Elmore, 1990). While these four aspects of restructuring are distinct in concept, in practice there are inevitably interrelationships and interdependencies among them.

Though ill-defined, restructuring as a concept is influencing the thinking of policy makers and educators throughout the nation. The very inclusiveness of the term may be one of its strengths, as disparate groups are able to make common cause under its rubric (Olson, 1988). Therefore, agreement on a precise definition, or even its operational dimensions is not a critical prerequisite to studying its meaning to school people. Quite the contrary, the definition for restructuring is being created daily as educators translate it into myriad programs and behaviors. Studying these behaviors provides insight into the operationalization of the definition.

Critical to restructuring arguments is the requirement that fundamental "rules of the game" are changed. In the Chicago experiment, for example, a ten member board consisting of two teachers, six parents, and two non-parent community members, has the power to hire, evaluate, and fire the principal and establish building policies (Hess, 1990). This clearly changes the rules of the game. Less obvious are many sites that are experimenting with one or more of these (and other) options under the guise of restructuring. In fact, many of these sites probably fall into the category of site-based management instead of full-scale school restructuring.

Site-based management (SBM), or school site management, is in concept and practice an integral component of school restructuring, and it is difficult to imagine restructuring without SBM. However, SBM may exist in the absence of restructuring and is already ingrained in the governance of hundreds, if not thousands, of American schools. One of the manifestations of school restructuring that is most common is to equate moving decision making to the site as having achieved restructuring.

Site-based management refers to two phenomena: (1) decentralized policy making and administration from the district offices to the individual school building and (2) participatory policy making and administration at the individual school building itself. These characteristics may be independent of one another. For example, a principal, or principals in a given district, may "run their own show" either as a matter of district policy or simply because they can get away with it. There is no essential connection to in-building participation. Similarly, principals may tolerate or encourage staff or parent input in such policy areas as discipline, curriculum, or even in teacher hiring, without this necessarily defining the building's relationship to the central office. We use the term "site based management" in this paper only when referring to those schools meeting both conditions of decentralization and participation.

Note that the decentralization implied by SBM contains ambiguities that depend on context. In large districts, the referent is often negative. Site-based management frees the school from the onerous burden of centralized bureaucracy with all the symbolic baggage that implies. However, the term may also refer to site-based management's presumed capacity for

responsiveness and "closeness to the customer," which is characteristic of schools in small districts as well as those larger ones where authority has been delegated to the building level.

What is "facilitative power?" What does it have to do with restructuring and site-based management?

Inevitably, restructuring and SBM mean more actors have more opportunities to exercise power in school buildings. Power-sharing is built into both concepts. For teachers, this means almost certainly greater involvement in collaborative decision-making processes. Potentially, teachers could have more influence, make more commitments of time, and perhaps lose some individual autonomy by becoming bound by collective commitments. Building administrators may find their roles as interpreters of district policy and authoritative implementors of building policy significantly altered. Some of what they do may change. How they do what they do certainly will change. We argue that, increasingly, school administrators will be facilitators of the policy process rather than dictators or even controllers. School leaders will be looking for ways to combine transactional and transformational leadership styles in new ways if they are to be effective players in restructuring and reform (Bass, 1985; Burns, 1978).

Writers about schools have usually assumed that power, authority, and domination are interconnected because the roots of power come from formal roles in organizations. In this view, power comes from structure; other aspects of individual power or unique situational circumstances that are not predictable from structure or role are typically viewed as far less important. This conceptualization has allowed observers of organizations to describe and assess acts of power as either "legitimate" or "illegitimate" by looking at their relationship to the authority structure (Etzioni, 1975). It has also supported studies that look at power as tactics to "retain or obtain control of real or symbolic resources" within the organizational structure (Bacharach and Lawler, 1980), as discretionary control of strategic contingencies and as resource dependencies needed to influence goals in the organizational structure (Pfeffer, 1981), and as systems of organizational politics where "insiders are not always "obedient" (Mintzberg, 1983: 171). Most studies of how power is used in schools and other organizations have focused on arguments about increasing control of necessary resources and on who should be included in controlling groups. Unfortunately, these conceptualizations of power are limited by the central acceptance of power as acts of domination legitimated by hierarchical structure (Dunlap and Goldman, 1991).

An alternative formulation is facilitative power, defined as the ability to help others achieve a set of ends that may be shared, negotiated, or complementary, without being either identical or antithetical. We have argued elsewhere that facilitative power has been neglected in theory and research about power in organizations (Dunlap & Goldman, 1989, 1990, 1991; Goldman & Dunlap, 1990). In exercising facilitative power, leaders can create or sustain favorable conditions for subordinates to enhance their individual and collective performances. If dominance is power <u>over</u> someone, facilitative power is power manifested <u>through</u> someone— more like the images of electrical or ecological circuits of power described by Clegg (1989) than like an ability to break or smash something by force.

School administrators exercise facilitative power when they engage in any or all of four relatively distinct activities: (1) they acquire or arrange those material resources that support staff activities and aspirations; (2) they create synergistic groups by combining those who can work together effectively, paying attention to both the skills and the personalities that comprise the mix; (3) they supervise and monitor activities to provide feedback and reinforcement; and (4) they use networks to provide links between the school and the outside world (Dunlap & Goldman, 1991).

Administrative exercise of facilitative power is not new in America's K-12 schools. For some administrators, facilitation is part of their administrative style, where they combine perhaps the image of the "broker" with that of the "catalyst" in the characterizations developed by Blumberg & Greenfield (1986). More significantly, there are a number of common school programs and projects which "fit" with facilitative power. These include the I.E.P. process and the consulting teacher model in special education; peer consultation among teachers and cooperative learning among students; thematic, multi-disciplinary curricula, including multi-cultural curricula, and curricula integrating computers; and community and alternative public school programs (Goldman & Dunlap, 1990).

The administrative implications of these programs have not been carefully examined in the research arena; however, prescriptions for successful programs do use a language very close to what we have termed facilitation. For instance, Brennan & Brennan (1988), Clarke (1984), and Westling (1989) indicate that administrator support and leadership are essential to implement programs for special needs students in mainstream schools. Grimmett (1987) argues that principals are crucial in implementing peer coaching, and Anastos & Ancowitz (1987), Chase & Wolfe (1989), and Goldman & Smith (1991) note that facilitating resources is the predominant form that support takes. In his research on successful public alternative schools, Chenoweth (1989) argues that "symbolic stroking" and "loose-tight" management styles account for school survival. Implementing these programs requires dealing with many of the same challenges schools face as they move towards SBM and restructuring. These include (1) the increasing knowledge bases of teachers, other education specialists, and even "clients;" (2) the expanding external involvement of parents and other patrons whose work styles and experiences may differ from those of educators; and (3) more collaborative policy-making with accommodates the growing knowledge bases and external involvements. Together these factors stimulate the development of facilitative leadership. Oregon's 2020 grant projects appeared to be good places to look for facilitative power. In the following section, we describe this grant program and the sample of schools in our study.

Oregon's 2020 Grant Projects

In this research we analyzed the proposals of 51 "2020" grants distributed to Oregon schools for the 1990-91 school year. The grant program was designed by the 1987 state legislature to foster educational innovation through professional development at the school site. Proposals had to be written and administered by certified staff on a representative site team, and had to be designed so that principals played a peripheral role in

implementation. Goal statements were also an essential component of each proposal. Schools successful in the competition received grants of $1,000 per teacher, and had considerable latitude in how these funds could be spent. They were required to maintain an oversight site team that included at least teaching and administrative staff. They were encouraged to include other school staff, parents, other community members, and students as well. Schools were allowed to compete for continuation grants on a yearly basis, and the majority have done so.

Through document analysis we identified a subset of 16 schools that used restructuring or SBM language as part of their project goals. We arranged to conduct interviews at these sites during February, 1991. A researcher met with the principal or, in one case, the vice-principal, and separately with at least one member of the teaching staff who had been a member of the school site team. This person was usually the chair or past-chair of the site team. Interviewees were asked questions about the circumstances that had made the school ready for a school-wide improvement project; how decisions at the school were made and whether and how they may have changed in recent years; how the principal and others exercised influence; how the site committee(s) worked; how information was shared; and how the school vision had been developed and what impact it had on decision making at the school (Appendix A).

The purpose of the interviews was not hypothesis testing or even to collect "evidence" per se. Rather, we hoped to find some encouragement for the possibility that school site reform with a significant teacher involvement and leadership was correlated with principal's facilitative leadership style.

The sample included three high schools located in middle-class communities with an average staff of 70; three middle schools, one in a middle-class community of 100,000, and two in smaller outlying communities, with an average staff of 32; five elementary schools in middle-class and rural communities, some of which served diverse student populations, with an average staff of 22; and one educational service district (a county-level education unit) in an urban area with primary responsibilities in the area of special education, and a staff of 25.

What We Learned

We have organized the data presentation as follows: (1) schools' readiness for change; (2) the changing authority structures and accountability; (3) the importance of "vision"; (4) how principals exercise power; (5) how teachers exercise power; (6) what works.

Readiness

Many of the schools had demonstrated a readiness for change even before applying for the 2020 grant. Several had been involved in such specific school improvement projects as the Northwest Regional Laboratory's "Onward to Excellence" program, the ASCD Restructuring Consortium, and various forms of strategic planning. The common consequence principals and teachers identified was that these types of activities allowed them to develop

skills in goal setting and in collecting more systematic data, and in focusing their efforts around explicitly stated, group-derived goals. For example, two principals made these comments:

> The school improvement process laid the groundwork. [The teachers] recognized that when they talked about "stuff" and worked together, it had an effect on everyone. The process brought the faculty together for discussions, for making agreements and for making decisions.

> We pretty much had the 2020 grant written before we actually got time to do it, because we'd set our goals before. So we knew where we were going, where we wanted to go, and 2020 helped us get there.

Even though the simple act of collecting data about the school did not always lead to a specific school reform effort, it seemed always to change the atmosphere of discussion. Individuals found it harder to reject problems with a "that isn't true for us" attitude when data in front of them said that it <u>was</u> true.

For some schools, readiness resulted from past failures as well as past successes:

> We applied for a 2020 grant the first year I was principal and we got turned down. Even that was helpful. It got us started on thinking about the next year. When we got to the next grant we had clearer ideas and wrote a stronger grant.

> We have been through five principals at least in seven years [when this principal arrived]. The principal here really cares about children and he constantly asks what is good for children and we had not had that before. He knows how to do observations, he gives good feedback, and we didn't have that before. That all began to set the stage for some of the changes that are going on now.

Periods of time in "readiness" activities varied from a few years to as many as fifteen in one building. In general, critical factors appeared to include organized staff collaboration on specific past activities and principal endorsement, and even enthusiasm, about those efforts. Two caveats are in order: first, these conditions may exist equally in schools not having received 2020 grants; and, second, proposal acceptance may in itself have generated momentum towards change.

Changing Core Technology of Teaching

There is clear evidence that these schools are actively involved in decisionmaking around the core technology of teaching and that this involvement is integrally related to the success of the change projects. This is reported separately by Conley (1991: in press).

Authority structures and accountability

Each 2020 school was required to establish a site committee that was comprised mostly of teaching staff with some administrative representation. This site committee was to be responsible for making decisions about the grant. Therefore, all of the schools had a site committee; however, the way in which the committee actually functioned and the membership of the committee varied from school to school. Subtle and not-so-subtle variations from school to school on team composition existed:

> The committee is elected, with a teacher as chair. There is an executive committee (three teachers and the principal) that meets once a week, and the 2020 committee meets once a week.

> There are two teachers and an education assistant on the committee besides [the principal]. And a parent.

> There is an executive committee of four members, three teachers and the principal.

> There are team leaders who represent each grade team, the Chapter 1 chairperson, a student resource teacher, the regular and the bilingual counselor, [and] a community representative from the district site-based management team.

These committees had real authority over managing the 2020 projects, and almost all of them reported concrete powers and concrete accomplishments. In most schools, the teachers are fiscal managers of the grant. This is a new role for teachers. They reported making decisions about supplies budgets, distribution of special education funding, implementation of computer labs, and so on, that would have traditionally been handled by the principal. Some of them reported having access to district-level budgets for the first time and of having increased input into the overall school budget because of their involvement in the 2020 projects. Many of them commented on the fact that they knew that their input and their decisions were "making a difference" in budget decisionmaking.

While teachers are taking on new responsibilities, principals continue to make central contributions to the change process. At one site, the principal did the writing of the 2020 grant but the teachers "did the brainstorming and planning." In some cases, teachers and principals collaborated on grant writing and budget planning. In some cases, members of committees or project teams were elected; in others, some were elected and some were appointed by the principal. While there was come variation in authority structures, most of these projects did not appear to be directed by administrators with teacher input, but to be directed by teachers with input by administrators. There was little conflict identified between these nontraditional structures and the more traditional site and district structures which surrounded the projects. People also seemed to be able to move with ease from one structure to the other.

Without exception, principals and teachers said that decisionmaking structures and processes had changed the school toward more teacher involvement:

> Things used to be very different. The change began with the school improvement model. The more we...got into the process...the more [we] also began to understand that [we] were responsible for the decision.

> The key to 2020 is that a group of staff, including the principal and administrators, get to decide how to allocate resources.

In several sites, staff also identified changes in decisionmaking processes between the principal and the teaching staff that also influenced how authority to make decisions was interpreted in daily practice. Typically, existing faculty groups (like faculty or curriculum councils) at these sites became more actively involved in budget and curricular decisions previously made by the principal and were consulted more often by the principal in areas where the principal still made the final decision.

In one school, when issues peripheral to the 2020 grant arise, the teachers and principal now form a special committee or task force to work on the issue where before the principal would see individual input and then make an independent decision. This theme of teacher input into principal decisions was repeated at many sites:

> The grade level teams and the other coordinating council go to the site committee for advice and consultation. They know that somebody is listening to them and they have a lot to say about what happens with the funds and programs. Many of the [site team members] have said that this is more work than they thought it would be...They coordinate curriculum and really have control over their overall planning. They identify when and how they want some staff development funds and a lot of that is worked out before they ever come to the site committee or to me for suggestions or more input. They know that they have almost complete influence over what happens in their programs.

The site committees are clearly important for setting 2020 grant policy and for administering the grant itself. These limited powers may give them greater expertise, visibility, and legitimacy for participation in broader school policy and decision making. In some schools, these new roles are even broader:

> [There are lots of committees]--science, literacy, computer, career education, arts and education--actually not a 2020 committee but interrelated--staff development, specialists team, office team--actually the office team and the site committee are almost exactly the same and the office team meets every week so that is part of why the site committee doesn't have to meet more often [than every six weeks].

The grants not only created different accountability structures, they also changed the way resources were allocated. Because teachers were integrally involved in the 2020 project and often directed particular activities, accountability was direct and shared. Teachers are a part of the structure because they had direct responsibility for developing and implementing

programs. Although the schools differed in size and type, and there was considerable latitude allowed in the way in which they decided to spend their money, most site committees chose to use funds for similar things: paying substitute teachers to "buy out" teacher time, as stipends to support teachers during summer months to work on grant or curriculum activities, for mini-grant programs within the school, for conferences, and to reduce teaching schedules for individuals to work on grant projects through a school year. To a lesser extent, site committees occasionally chose to bring in consultants and to subsidize travel of one or more committee members to another exemplary site.

The "Vision Thing"

In recent years, research and writing on effective schools--and on organizations of all kinds--has stressed the importance of "vision." In the leadership literature, vision resides in the school leader more than anywhere else, and it is no accident that the National Commission on Excellence in Educational Administration leads off its report with a chapter on "a vision of school leadership' (Griffiths, et al., 1987). In the 2020 schools, however, vision is embodied by the process rather than by individuals. Virtually all of our respondents talked about vision building as a collaborative, iterative endeavor, involving most of the staff. These vision building activities include the principal as a valued participant, and sometimes even as a leader of discussion.

> The mission statement was exciting. We all had the same basic values and the task was putting them in a coherent and short statement that we could share. We just made up the posters we wanted to move from just being part of the district to what is really unique about the school.

> [We're] working on it. [The teachers] came back from the last inservice with some direction toward a vision. That is one of the advantages of the 2020 grant--it can help them look at where they are headed...teachers will get more involved when they realize the effect that a school-wide vision will have on them.

Principals do have, or at least believe they have, an important role in the vision building process. Principals could reinforce the school vision, not only by using it as a guide to their own decisions, but also by the ways they used the vision in their capacity as a role model.

> If there was a common vision, it would be that we are a family and that we are working together to help students. I've wondered if vision should be the next step, but so far I haven't focused on it because when things really start happening around here is when we focus on what is good for kids. When we start talking about dreams or nightmares, people tend to pull away and don't want to think about how that is going to affect them.

> The [staff has developed a shared vision], partly due to the coaching going on [by the administrative team]. Before the standardization [visit], I got in front of every one on the staff and gave

my version of the mission of the school and I got a clapping ovation from the staff.

In some schools, vision building was a slow and deliberate process. Identifying a common vision did not necessarily occur in the first year of the restructuring process. Often it came about by a process of identifying common themes or values over time. In one school that had received 2020 funding for all three years of the program, the staff only felt they were ready to begin vision building in the third year. Interestingly, they were able to come to agreement on the essentials of their mission statement in a single evening-long retreat.

While "process" was important, the school vision statements had significant "content" components as well, and these reinforced the impact of the vision-development activities:

> The stated vision is this idea of closeness to the child, child-centered learning, where you look at how the child learns, how we create an environment for that learning, not change the child, as much as change the milieu. I think that's how people see things, but this is not a homogeneous school, not a homogeneous staff. But there is more common ground now than there was three years ago.
>
> For instance, I was talking to staff at the start of the year and I suggested that we might want to look at developing a common vision statement. And one staff member said, "let' s look at discipline." So we did, and we got the 'every student has the right to a positive school environment" into the discipline plan. We believe that all of the kids here can be successful, and I believe in the small school being like a family. I also have the vision that I want other people to know how well we do here and attract other people to come here. And that all kids belong, we talk a lot about that -- all of our kids have challenges and gifts -- and we need to find out what those gifts are. We work on that together and I talk it a lot, but it isn't written down as such yet.
>
> ...a vision of the school as a place where we treat people better than others schools do, that kids will behave as adults if they are treated like adults, that there are no class differences.

Finalized vision statements had important consequences for the 2020 schools. In some buildings, the vision statement became the basis for virtually all school decisions. One vice-principal noted that it made life much easier for the administrative team (principal and three vice-principals) in his high school because they could relate their actions and decisions specifically to the school's four goals. Activities related to one of the goals were given top priority; unrelated activities were seldom given special attention.

.At another school, the principal made this statement.

> [The 2020 projects] provide a focus for the building...The gist of [our vision] is that every child is capable of success and we want them to learn as much as they can. . .the committee put the statement together. It is in the grant, and the staff reviewed it. Yes, we use it as a guideline

> to accomplish directions and outcomes....Actually, we are far enough along in this process that the goals are a lot more useful in setting daily activities than the vision statement...the goals are more specific and therefore more helpful and practical.

When a vision emerged from a collective endeavor, it tended to be used in daily decision making. It also came to be used in teacher and principal descriptions of their 2020 projects. At one site, a researcher waiting for the principal to return from a hallway interruption fell into conversation with two young middle school students who had been sent to the principal's office for misbehavior. When asked what the vision was for their school, they repeated it immediately and sighed, "Yeah, everybody is always going on in this school about how every student can learn, and they all talk to each other, and our parents are in on it, and it is really hard to get away with anything!"

In summary, development of a relatively explicit vision provided a set of shared expectations. As one teacher put it,

> People are talking the same language, they have the same kinds of informal expectations for one another, more common ground. We've talked about building from congeniality through collegiality to collaboration, and we see ourselves as a school somewhere around collegiality and sometimes with collaboration, but moving in that direction.

How power is exercised by principals

Principals in 2020 schools use facilitative power to help staff develop and implement goals. For example, they acquire and arrange material resources. Material resources include money, space, scheduling and people. Sometimes the principal would inform the site committee about a decision that was to be made and would state the limitations and availability of resources. More often, the primary help from the principal was in assisting the staff in utilizing already existing resources:

> The first thing I did was to aim at a common prep time... I eliminated morning duty for some people, so now they have a common time. Each team also meets for a full half day of release time to talk and plan at least once each year.

> I've done lots of "creative" staffing and funding, like moving the special education people around in ways that the staff really liked, and looking for support in the computer lab. I helped move the staff development from a program the principal ran to one that the staff plans and runs on their own.

> Basically, not to bother them, help them clear the way, help them as much as I can so they can focus on the 2020 grant and have more time.

Resource management in some schools has gone beyond the requirements of the 2020 projects. Facilitative management opened new budget responsibilities for teachers in the wake of successful 2020 budget

decisions. Principals were much more likely to give dollar figures to a department and seek advice on how to proceed with a change or a cut in budget. One principal used the decision about technology as an example:

> Last year there was a need for increased technology in the school. Each department looked at textbook needs, decided what was essential and "kicked in" the rest for computers. The school bought Macintosh computers to create a computer lab... Things used to be very different.

These principals also create synergistic groups. They select and develop groups of people who can work effectively, and then empower them by giving them meaningful assignments. Further, they work continually to help other staff participate. To some principals, arranging material resources and creating synergistic groups first involved "removing barriers" to successful implementation of teacher ideas. They see this as a "constant activity" that never stops.

These principals often provide regular feedback and reinforcement, sometimes simply by "letting go," and allowing teachers to make their own decisions and their own mistakes.

> I just let them go and try to keep up, and keep things going, and help them become realistic about where the whole staff is going.

> I try to be a facilitator, cheerleader, reminder -- to go to meetings. I meet with the chairs, I listen a lot and try to keep my mouth shut.

> I'm part of the management team. I don't block, but I'm free to express my opinion. We all are free to share our feelings about things. I'm open and honest, so when it comes to making a decision that's important to them, they can make the decision because we've developed a high degree of trust. I think the trust is key. It goes both ways.

These principals' leadership style was fundamentally non-authoritarian, and hence attuned to a project that carried the potential for teachers to develop and demonstrate their own leadership skills.

> [The principal] is more available to all of us for help and consultation. Otherwise, he is pretty much in a basic collaborative style. He really has an open door policy. He's excited and happy about how people are getting turned on to new ideas and he let's that be known.

> I refuse to be deferred to as the principal. If someone wants clarification, OK, but otherwise I say, "you had probably better talk to the chair of the committee about that." I try to redirect the question so it does not come to me but to the responsible person or committee. That is important. Ego can impede the outcomes. You have to be ready to let go and keep on letting go, so others know that they are really in charge of something and really take responsibility for it.

Equally important were the ways in which the 2020 grants may have reinforced these principals in their ability to be human resource managers and to support the professional and personal growth of the teachers.

> She functions more as a leader than a supervisor or manager. She supports us, provides means for us to grow. She really fills a leadership role...always has been a person who would take outside input and share power and authority...she is just stronger...she expects us to take on responsibilities where teachers wouldn't do that in a more traditional school.

> I try to keep some of [the process] on track. In the first year, people were all over the place. The goals are on the wall, we say "look at them" to remind them. We try to get them to do the things they say they want to do. Our role has shifted. We're not doing it. We don't own the task any more. We need to constantly remind [the teachers] because this is new behavior for them. You remind them they have money to manage, suggesting, not telling, them how they might go about this. There's a lot of that coaching that goes on with these committees.

Principals also often talked about their primary role as "supporting other people" and "helping them get recognition."

> Talking to others, working with others, and keeping on the look out for potential problems and potential good ideas.

> Coaching...a minute here, a minute there. I'm always looking for opportunities. It is becoming increasingly more evident [that this is what my role is].

These principals also use outside networks to like the schools and the school staff. They reported working with parents in new ways, and working on activities outside the district that create new opportunities for recognition of the teachers and the school.

The 2020 process created new needs for information generation and distribution, and these principals stepped in to fill this need. What teachers typically know is information about their students, knowledge about the subject matter they teach, and knowledge about pedagogical techniques. As they become more collaborative, they have to learn what colleagues are doing and what they need. As they take on project management responsibilities, they have to understand more about budgets and more about district rules and regulations, especially those relating to financial transactions. These principals actively facilitated sound teacher decision making by helping teachers obtain the information they now needed.

Teachers need to know more and, as they learn, their desire for more information increases. They inquire about related data, form an expanded understanding of schoolwide functioning, and increase input into decisionmaking beyond the scope of the specific grant project.

Not all the newly circulating information is budgetary or bureaucratic in nature. Much of it concerns transmitting ideas and successful practices elsewhere, as reported in professional and practitioner journals. This transmission is typically from principals, who scan publications, to teachers.

> I'm constantly giving out information to people to facilitate...and me screening. I read everything, then, I cut out articles I like and put them in their boxes...Teachers don't have time to do that.
>
> Putting things in their boxes, sharing research with them...that sort of thing has helped teachers just become more familiar with what is going on...
>
> Teachers appreciate the information transfer, and this is largely because they themselves are interested and involved in the restructuring process in which they are engaged. The principal is very quick to share articles, zip out copies to us—a lot of circulating stuff like that."
>
> It's a bit of a joke around here--[the principal's] trying to kill us with information. I kept track of it for a year; it filled up a notebook of about 400-500 pages. He's been wonderful. We were doing an investigation with small committees. He provided a plethora of information, research, that would take any individual a great deal of time to come up with. He had it at his fingertips. I wouldn't want to read all the stuff he gets all the time anyway. He made that effort so much more possible.
>
> At times principals distribute information with a specific agenda on their part and sometimes the information was provided to remove a roadblock to a decision process, or to test to see if teachers were ready to move in a new direction. This indirect lobbying was typically accompanied by lots of informal lobbying -- chats in the hallway, a visit over lunch, a comment or two at the end of a conversation on another topic, and so on. Many of these principals commented on the fact that they had few formally scheduled meetings with their staff; most of their interactions were brief and very informal.

Perhaps the most striking finding to us in how principals exercise power in school restructuring projects is in how they deliberately promote and "model" visionary behavior. The literature suggests that principals should embody a set of transcendent values that sets both the direction and tone of the school if change is to occur, and we saw that with these principals. Equality, collaboration, and ongoing personal and professional development are themes that emerged several times in the interviews.

> I think that I am very good at supporting other people, and I also model myself the kinds of behaviors that lead to increased collaboration...I think different things can happen with different people and I try to model it myself--continuing to learn in different way.

> I think I practice this in everything--an absolutely strong belief in the efficacy of all staff members. I am driven by that belief. I use adult development theory, especially styles and types, to find what is unique about each person and then I cultivate that in them. Sometimes that takes me three or four years, you know, to really get to know them. Then, I can work with each one in the way that most helps them develop.

> I talk with people about the difference between being collegial and congenial. I will engage in that...over the course of a day, I will talk with each person...outside the meetings, lay groundwork...sort of collegial community coaching. Few appointments.

Teachers are attentive to their principals' collaborative style and efforts at facilitation. Their comments indicate that these behaviors predated 2020 projects, suggesting a "fit" between project requirements and the leadership styles of principals in schools applying for the grants.

> [The principal] has always been this way. He makes it easier for everything to happen, because he has always modelled listening and caring about people's input.

> She displays help, more than doing the task. Not really a change in style—she has always been this kind of leader.

> He does a very good job of [facilitating change]. He also is very strong in his drive. He never seems to quit. The rest of us are shot, saying "not another piece of paper, not another meeting"--he'll keep you going to keep that drive, that vision in motion. That's helped us achieve us getting us where we wanted to get as a staff.

While most principals in the 2020 schools had long developed collaborative leadership styles and utilized facilitative power, they also felt that the projects had sparked real differences in both their attitudes and their behaviors. Principals indicated that some of these behaviors were learned, rather than natural to their leadership style.

> I have learned to be more sensitive to classified folks...and so I added them to the 2020 projects. Parents, too. So the school advisory council has representatives much broader than former committees.

> I do less worrying. More people are involved, monitoring things. I'm talking differently to people. Whereas I used to assume that if everything wasn't perfect, it was my responsibility, now I can say back to them "well, why didn't we have a meeting?"

Several principals describe change in terms of "stepping back," "keeping their mouth shut," "getting things started and then letting them run." This was remarked upon by almost every principal in the sample.

> I [used to be] more active in discussions, throwing out ideas and such. Now, I try to be quieter so others don't get overwhelmed by me. I

> usually don't stay for the whole time; I want them to know that I care and that I am ready to participate, but that they can clearly go on without me.
>
> Before I would have just mandated. Now, teachers make decisions, not me. It doesn't work when decisions are mandated...I want decisions to be made in such a way that teachers believe in what they do.

Many of the 2020 principals stepped out of direct leadership roles and took on support roles that helped the teachers make decisions. However, principals do not consider their role to be passive. Teachers sense the changes as well and, in the following quote, one teacher indicates tacitly the subtlety of the changes.

> There are individuals [who] think he plays a far stronger role in guiding what we're [doing] than others. Those who have been very active in the decisionmaking process know that it is a shared process. His drive toward facilitating the process probably has made some things happen that wouldn't otherwise.

When asked whether teachers see them as "more or less central" to decision-making, principals paused a few moments to think before responding. Typically they thought "that is a good but hard question." In one case, the answer was "less central, no. Less powerful; there are some people who have some problems with that, who would like us to make the decisions." Another principal replied, "Well, I'm perceived as pretty central in some, and less central in others. I would be seen as less central to the grant, but pretty central to the behavior process." One principal inverted the question: "I think they see me just as central, but I think they see themselves as powerful, too." These responses hint that power in these schools may not be perceived as "zero-sum." As the number of new activities and decision-making opportunities grows, power itself expands.

Teachers seem to share this perception with their principals. They said things like, "I never thought of her as real powerful. I thought of her as real important" and "he is centrally decentralized." In some buildings, the 2020 process represents an evolution of already existing attitudes and practices and both teachers and principals talked about the principal as less central than the old-fashioned stereotypical authoritarian principal, but, "then [our principal] has been that way the whole time."

Some teachers sense that "payoffs" for principals are value driven, and may not depend primarily on positions of authority in the building. They often commented that "teacher empowerment" really fit the principal's style and personality, and that authority in the "old sense" had never been at issue for these principals.

How Power is Exercised by Teachers

The 2020 program is characterized by teacher-written and teacher-directed grant projects, so every site reported that teachers were very involved in acquiring and arranging material resources. Teachers almost

always did routine, but still new, chores such as arranging and running staff meetings. But in most schools they also manage budgets and curriculum in new, expanded ways. Many teachers commented that "there isn't a decision about the school that we are not actively involved in making."

Teachers often commented that they are behaving more "politically" in their schools, albeit in a facilitative rather than an authoritative fashion. When asked how they exercised power and influence, many teachers on site committees talked about how they inform, encourage, and work with their professional peers. Like their principals, they lobby "informally" in hallway chats, conversations over lunch, and in the staff room. They also were actively engaged in forming synergistic groups of teachers, parents or students, in a fashion very similar to that reported by the principals. Also, they similarly commented on the role of providing positive reinforcement and feedback to other teachers with whom they worked. This feedback and reinforcement was often described as essential to "bringing some people along." They often commented that they had developed new skills at working with other people and in coordinating and directing the work of groups.

Principals noted the changing roles of teachers and typically added that it is a very positive change.

> There are people on this staff who are energized, dynamite. They're gaining knowledge on their own, they're reading journals, attending conferences, attending a two-week institute on learning styles...they're getting it on their own...one of our goals is teachers training teachers. Teachers are volunteering their time and the grant pays for them to prepare.

Teachers less often reported using outside networks to link schools to the outside community, but frequently reported using state and national networks to bring new information to teacher-participants, or to get "reluctant participants" exposed to new ideas in a "less threatening way." This was typically described as quite time consuming.

If teachers were in a formal role in the site committee or a related subcommittee, they always reported increased activities in bringing information to people, in preparing minutes and other data on meetings and projects, and increased time spent in communicating with affected staff about program events.

Like their principals, these teachers often commented on the importance of "modeling effective behavior" and encouraging "high standards." They did not always feel that they got approval from other teachers for this behavior, but they identified it as being very important in helping change occur.

Some teachers reported changes in their own attitudes toward their work.

> It has offered me a challenge and opportunity to be involved where I never was before in new and exciting activities . I'm more motivated. I am growing. This is an exciting time for me as a teacher--I

am re-invigorated. This is an exciting time for me as a professional, when some of the research says I should be experiencing burnout or rustout.

This year, [for example,] I look back at the science instruction I've done and I have been more excited about everything I'm doing than I have been in years. The teaching is an indirect effect, but there it is. I do more demonstrations. I wrote a new lab book and I hadn't done that in years. There is a freshness that I can't quantify. This is more invigorating, more emotional, but I know people who would look upon my things as not good--they would feel imposed upon to do what I do--and I can understand that. Not everyone is from the same mold. But [this is great for me] and I like this.

I have an alternative room of 5th and 6th graders who are at risk--the grant supports me to be away from the room to learn things I can use. I didn't expect to find that I liked being a leader; I didn't expect that. I can see that some of the teachers' power comes from making decisions...

Has the 2020 program changed teachers' behaviors at work? Primarily, teachers report more willingness to collaborate and more effective collaboration. It appears that site team leaders have been instrumental in sustaining these changes. Collaborative activities continue to occur without direct input from site team members, and this has affected instructional activities as well as the decision-making that is part of 2020.

I know that we are moving closer together as a staff and that is exciting. I have certainly become more involved in more collaborative activities than before--and there has been a very direct positive impact on my teaching. I now try more collaborative problem solving in my science classes and it has really invigorated my teaching.

There is certainly more collaboration, and the 2020 grant is part of that. So is the openness of staff to work other hours on projects that they think are important. Five years ago it was hard to stay in the building after 4 and now I don't know how many people are coming and going but it is lots because they are in charge of what they are doing.

Collaboration combined with the existence of a vision changed the work environment for some teachers. Some teachers reported an increased willingness to take risks in their teaching, because the vision supported active experimentation. Others said that their increased energy in their classroom activities stemmed from a "contagious energy" coming from the other teachers involved in the project.

The biggest thing is trying things I haven't tried before. I know that what I've always done produces x results. If I felt discomfort with those results, I'm not going to get different results unless I try something different. The vision suggests differences that would require me to make shifts, one of the reasons I'm trying the [teacher-led class of teachers looking at curricular connections]. I'm exhausted at

the end of each day, yet on the other hand, I see some real plus's that speak to the kinds of things we're trying to get to with the vision.

Teachers reported doing more group problem solving, working on more budget decisions, more coordination and followup inside the school and outside the school in the greater community, and simply in spending more time together working on a mutual agenda.

What Works and Doesn't Work

Several things appeared to be an integral part of these successful grants and they are described briefly here. First, the principals and the teachers in these schools clearly had positive and successful working relationships. Often in spite of a surrounding bureaucracy which continued to promote more traditional and hierarchical relationships, these school teams were able to negotiate their way to a more interactive and iterative problem solving process that worked for their school. These positive interactive relationships often extended to members of the community, to other staff members in the school, and to students and parents. The relationships are substantive; they typically revolve around central questions of teaching and curriculum as directly related to "how it helps our kids." The relationships also clearly promote increased levels of communication and typically lead to increased interactions around activities outside the grant program.

A second positive factor identified in these programs was an effective use of "made time." Almost every principal and teacher mentioned time as a key to achieving success. "We can take time to do what is important" was an often repeated phrase.

Both principals and teachers often said that the biggest help from the 2020 grant is the ability to buy time so there is time for everyone to work together.

> The biggest roadblock to change is not needing more money; it is needing more time. [Teachers] need more time to have discussions and teachers need to act like professionals instead of union members. If [I] could ask the [state superintendent of public instruction] for one thing, [I] would request that the number of hours used for planning would not take away from the 990 hour requirement. More planning time would be cheaper than 2020 grants.

> We've known what we wanted to do for years--we just never had the time or the little bit of money we needed to get started. It is great having the release time and to meet every week and two times a year for half day planning sessions.

> We were doing a lot before 2020 came along, so 2020 just, well, it has helped a lot, especially because it helps us buy out the time to actually get together and do things. Without the time, things would be lots slower and lots harder, so it is essential but it isn't all that is happening.

A third factor identified by these project participants is an added ability for the staff to develop as a group in needed directions Principals and teachers at these sites often talked about the lack of constraints on how they used the grant—on how much it helped them to be able to move in the direction they thought they should go.

> It is a program that we could grab a hold of and get us some money, where we could identify strategies and we were ready for, and make some of the gradual changes that might lead to more change later. We needed some success, and 2020 helped us get that.

> You need that seed money to get started. Now, I think that if the money went away that the teachers would go on with the process. They would find a way to fund it if the money disappeared.

> We have a lot of low SES and the extra money really helps us with that population.

> It's supported my own vision of what I want to do in special education. It's given me more opportunities to be able to get out there, be with regular teachers, and share the vision of what I want to do in my setting.

A fourth factor which we can identify in each of these successful projects is the existence of a least a "critical mass" of willing and able staff.

> [The best part is] this is ninety percent very exciting and ten percent overwhelming...there are very few staff who hold back...even [when this] scares people.

> This staff really wanted change. We didn't have a clear consensus definition of where we wanted to be, but once the process was put in motion, [the principal] has been very good about knowing about process to keep the momentum going...he came on board at a time when he knew the climate and interest for change was there, so it wasn't one he created.

Each of the schools had a cadre of teachers willing and able to take on the responsibility of grant writing and grant administration. While this capacity is not unusual, in many schools there are strong norms against teachers becoming involved in "administration" and using "power" (Lortie, 1975; Rosenholtz, 1989).

As one team leader put it, "teachers ask 'where are my loyalties?'...(S)ome teachers feel [the very idea of] power is a threat." The people who didn't see themselves going in the general direction of this new "participative" school, typically left and so the personnel rosters in these schools has often changed substantially during these change years. The teachers we interviewed said that the teachers who left the schools left partly because there was a common vision being articulated with which they did not agree. They subsequently decided to work elsewhere. This made the remaining teachers typically more alike in their views of what changes were

needed at the school. The remaining staff was typically described as being "more collaborative," "more communicative," and ready for more "self-responsibility."

The grant was also often identified as a place where teachers could take their ideas about curriculum or students, and find other teachers willing to talk with them about the ideas. This was identified by one teacher as "a luxury" not experienced in other schools; he said that usually the only time he visited with other teachers about teaching was in infrequent inservice activities or even less frequent conferences. The grant was identified as an excellent common ground for discussion where, if a good idea was identified and a plan to implement it worked out, the teachers also had the ability to put the necessary material resources behind it, try it out, and then come back to each other to evaluate the success of the idea.

In a similar vein, both teachers and principals often identified the absence of bureaucratic roadblocks as a major strength of this program. Several principals noted that the absence of bureaucracy, the presence of direct teacher-led decisionmaking, and the ability and time to work together, had done more to breakdown curriculum departments than any other single act in the past.

On the other hand, principals and teachers also identified several problems with these grants. In the same way time was identified as a key to success, it was also identified as the continuing major roadblock to even greater or faster change. The additional time necessary to do collaborative decisionmaking also represented an investment that, for several sites, had not yet begun to pay off in results for children or even in satisfaction for many staff members.

Several sites also identified the inadequacy of funds as a major impediment. While they appreciated the additional flexibility and freedom to experiment allowed by the grant, they often longed for greater funds to support greater efforts. They argued that the extra staff development funds derived from the grant supported new activities, but in no way fully compensated team members or other staff who took part in additional meetings or workshops. Some principals pointed out that "lack of funds" was used as a reason to not do something, however. This is no less true for these successful change projects as in the rest of daily school life.

Sometimes teachers said that efforts foundered "because the principal has not been 'willing' to direct it." More often, however, principals were faulted more for too much "interference" than for lack of direction. Most of these teachers said they were quite able to direct their own activities, and preferred to look upon the principal as a key resource instead of as the director.

Conclusions

These principals and teachers did not spend much time talking about what restructuring or site-based management means; they spent their time doing what made sense to them for their school and didn't focus on definitions. Our ability to define more precisely the concepts of restructuring and SBM is

limited to our interpretations of their reported behavior. To us, it looked like what these people did was spend some time talking about what restructuring means to them, and then they go forward in action regardless of whether consensus is reached on definitions or goals. The process is iterative, and lack of definition does not prevent action. Typically, they came back to the definitions periodically. They came back through discussion of vision and goals; where definitions made sense to them was primarily where they could interpret them directly into their daily work with students in schools.

Typically, these school people also did not mention district interference in their programs, or any significant change in district policy to accommodate their program. We deduced from this that the district policy on decentralized decisionmaking was at least open enough or distant enough to have little direct effect on these small site-based programs.

Effective change clearly goes beyond restructuring and site-based management. Our initial pessimism about the probability of successful change was heavily influenced by the substantial literature on the difficulty of comprehensive change in schools (Fullan, 1985; Berman and McLaughlin, 1978; Cuban, 1984; Sarason, 1971; Malen, 1990 ; Kirst, 1991)

However, over our months of time spent in these creative schools, talking to energized staff and students, we began to look at that extensive literature in new ways. We began to wonder if a very important, and very basic, first step had often been missed in earlier attempts to change schools.

That important first step was present in every one of these projects. They were started by informal groups of staff who had something they wanted to do, believed that they could do it with some additional resources, had a principal who supported their efforts or created the conditions that favored the development of their ideas, and encountered a minimum of bureaucratic interference in spending their dollars in any way they saw fit.

In short, the teachers and the principals in these successful projects chose to act, and were allowed to do so, with minimal interference. Instead of failure, the high skills, high levels of motivation, and high energies directed toward the projects emerged in unique successful patterns. Our pessimism is now optimism that small dollars can yield big outcomes—at least in those sites where staff are ready, the principal is supportive, some "vision" is shared, and the system does not get in the way.

Teacher roles and involvement in these 2020 schools can be contrasted with earlier programs of school improvement, such as Madeline Hunter's "Elements of Effective Instruction." The impetus for implementation of this program rarely came from the teaching staff. Normally, ownership was lodged with the principal or the district staff development office. Although it often generated initial excitement, its long term effects were rarely significant, particularly when compared with the often substantial resources devoted to training and coaching activities (Robbins and Wolfe, 1987).

The purpose here is not to disparage Hunter or the Elements model of instruction. In fact, some 2020 schools have chosen to have training in this

program. The difference is that this decision was made by teachers, based on a perceived need derived from data they collected and discussions they led. Teachers not only have ownership; they retain control. They may adapt, modify, or even opt out altogether without fear of negative consequence if they determine that a better alternative exists.

Hunter has contended that her techniques are a means to enhance teacher decision making, and it is likely that in the schools where her program were implemented successfully, there was considerable adaptation of the program by teachers and administrators to the needs of their building; they made decisions about what worked, what didn't, and why. The 2020 grant program appears to be providing teachers with many opportunities to develop their decision making skills, both within and outside of the classroom. This enhanced professionalism appears to be a key prerequisite to substantive change in schools, given their bureaucratic nature and the overall stability of their work force. Unlike the Hunter model, these programs can be changed just as they were developed and implemented -- by the people who chose to work with them in the first place.

In the final analysis, people -- not reforms, regulations, or rules -- are the key force in achieving change of any significant nature in schools. The people in these 2020 schools appear to be developing both the capacity and expectation to be involved centrally in determining the goals and conditions of their work. Schools where principals learn (or sense) how to work in concert with these expectations appear to be more capable of developing new conceptions of themselves, and taking the painful, and not immediately rewarding, steps necessary to move in those directions.

These schools provide an environment in which teachers (and administrators) can develop the skills and behaviors necessary to share decision making responsibilities. Rather than providing training in "problem solving," "consensus building," or "communication skills," these projects provide school staffs with real reasons to solve problems, seek consensus, and communicate. In this environment, when training in group process skills is offered, it can be applied immediately to real situations that have meaning and value to the participants. This argues that programs designed to enhance group process skills in the absence of authentic situations in which participants apply these skills will be unlikely to achieve the goal of enhanced participation in decision making.

The concept of facilitative power helps lead to an identification of behaviors that are consonant with this set of human relations. Dunlap and Goldman (1990) have argued that principals who use facilitative power will acquire and arrange material resources, create synergistic groups, provide feedback and reinforcement, and use outside networks to link schools. These activities were readily identified by the principals in this project and, somewhat to our surprise and delight, by the teachers as well. In addition, the principals and teachers identified several other activities related to a pattern of facilitative power: the regular use of informal lobbying instead of formal meetings, increased communication activities, and the importance of modelling and reinforcing vision-related behaviors. Facilitative power appears to be a particularly useful concept when applied in the context of

school restructuring and site-based management to understand which approaches may be succeeding, and why.

We have concluded that the key ingredient to these successful reform projects is that these school professionals had the skill and the opportunity to experiment with reform until they found a way that it made great sense for them. While they often started with a Sizer article, or a McCune talk, they quickly leaped from attempts to understand someone else's direction, to experimenting with their own. Their directions may have originally been rooted in someone else's "master plan" for reform, but they were quickly modified and re-modified to meet the idiosyncratic needs of the specific site. What is different about these successful projects from less successful reform efforts is that in these projects reform is real to the people implementing it. It is not an abstract concept, or mandated policy, or foreign program. In fact, we expect that these successful reformers can be just as capable as other school people of developing non-cooperative structures that could distance them from a mandated reform if they did not think that the mandate fit their site. And we ended up agreeing that this freedom to chose their path, combined with the ways and means to move along it, is why the concept of facilitative power was useful to us in describing their activities. Only concepts that encourage voluntary independent activities will help researchers understand how change projects can be successful.

We know that more data of this type needs to be collected, that we want to look particularly closely at high schools in future research, and that there is much available in the data already collected in this study that we can analyze for additional understanding of principal styles, collaborative structures, and gender interactions. Having said that, we emerge enthusiastic about the potential for real, sustained change in schools where principals and teachers alike are encouraged and supported in self-directed change efforts.

References

Anostos, J. & Ancowitz, R. 1987. A Teacher-Directed Peer Coaching Project. *Educational Leadership* 45 (No. 3): 54-57.

Bacharach, S. & Lawler, E. 1980. *Power and politics in organizations.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Bass, B. 1985. *Leadership and performance beyond expectations.* NY: Free Press.

Berman, P., and M. McLaughlin. (1978,). *Federal Programs Supporting Educational Change. Volume 8: Implementing and Sustaining Innovations.* Rand Corporation, Santa Monica, CA.

Blumberg, A. & Greenfield, W. 1986. *The effective principal: Perspectives on leadership.* Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Burns, J. M. 1978. *Leadership.* NY: Harper & Row.

Cetron, M. J., W. Rocha, and R. Luckins. "Into the 21st Century: Long Term Trends Affecting the United States." *The Futurist.* 22.4 (1988): 29-42.

Chase, A. & Wolfe, P. 1989. Off to a Good Start in Peer Coaching. *Educational Leadership* 46 (No. 8): 37.

Chenoweth, T. 1989. The Survival of Public Alternative Schools: A Symbolic Perspective. *Urban Education* 24: 93-108.

Clarke, B. R. 1984. The Role of the Principal in Mainstreaming. *British Columbia Journal of Special Education* 8: 247-55.

Clegg, S. R. 1989. *Frameworks of power.* London: Sage.

Conley, David. *Oregon's 2020 Schools: What They're Telling Us About School Restructuring.* OSSC Bulletin. Eugene, Oregon: Oregon School Study Council. In press.

Cuban, Larry. (1984). How Teachers Taught: Constancy and Change in American Classrooms, 1890-1980. New York: Longman.

David, Jane L. (1989). Synthesis of Research on School-Based Management. *Educational Leadership.* 46(9), May, 45-52.

Devaney, Kathleen. *The Lead Teacher: Ways to Begin.* Paper prepared for the Task Force on Teaching as a Profession, Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy. 1987.

Dunlap, D. & Goldman, P. 1989. 'Power Over' versus 'Power Through:' Professional-Bureaucratic Relationships in the 1990's. University Council on Educational Administration, Phoenix.

Dunlap, D. & Goldman, P. 1990. Power as a 'System of Authority' versus Power as a 'System of Facilitation.' American Educational Research Association, Boston.

Dunlap, D. & Goldman, P. 1991. Rethinking power in schools. *Educational Administration Quarterly* 27: 5-29.

Elmore, R. & Associates. 1990. *Restructuring schools: The next generation of educational reform.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Etzioni, A. (1975). *A comparative analysis of complex organizations*, revised and enlarged edition.. New York: Free Press.

Fullan, Michael. (1985). Change Processes and Strategies at the Local Level. *The Elementary School Journal.* 85(3), January, 391-421.

Goldman, P. & Dunlap, D. 1990. Reform, restructuring, site-based management, and the new face of power in schools. University Council on Educational Administration, Pittsburgh.

Goldman, P. & Smith, N. S. 1991. Portrait of a successful educational innovation: British Columbia's program for quality teaching. Canadian Society for the Study of Education, Kingson, Ont..

Grimmett, P. 1987. The Role of District Supervisors in the Implementation of Peer Coaching. *Journal of Curriculum and Supervision* 3: 3-28.

Hess, G. Alfred. 1990, March. *Chicago School Reform: What It is and How It Came To Be.* Chicago: Chicago Panel on Public School Policy and Finance.

Hodgkinson, Harold. "The Right Schools for the Right Kids." *Educational Leadership.* 45.5 (1988): 10-15.

Kearns, David. "An Educational Recovery Plan for America." *Phi Delta Kappan.* (April, 1988): 565-570.

Kearns, David, and Dennis Doyle. *Winning the Brain Race: A Bold Plan to Make Our Schools Competitive.* San Francisco: ICS Press, 1988.

Kirst, Mike. (1991). Pitfalls to Restructuring. *EDCAL.* 20(24), February 11, 1.

Liontos, Lynn Balster. *Collaboration Between Schools and Social Services.* Eugene, OR: ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management, 1990.

Little, Judith Warren. "The "Mentor" Phenomenon and the Social Organization of Teaching." *Review of Research in Education.* 16 (1990)

Lortie, D. 1975. *Schoolteacher.* Chicago: U. of Chicago.

Malen, Betty. (1990). Unfulfilled Promises. *School Administrator.* 47(2), February, 30,32,53-56,59.

Mandel, Michael, and Aaron Bernstein. "Dispelling the Myths that Are Holding Us Back." *Business Week, Special Report.* no.3192 (December 17, 1990): 66-70.

Mintzberg, H. (1983). *Power in and around organizations.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Misahiko, Aoki. "Frontiers in Corporate Globalization." *Japan Echo.* 17 (1990): 26.

Olson, Lynn. "The 'Restructuring' Puzzle: Ideas for Revamping 'Egg-Crate' Schools Abound, but to What Ends?" *Education Week.* (Nov. 2, 1988): 7, 11.

Pfeffer, J. 1981. *Power in Organizations.* Marshfield, MA: Pitman Publishing Co.

Robbins, Pam, and Pam Wolfe. (1987). Reflections on a Hunter-Based Staff Development Project. *Educational Leadership.* 44(5), February, 56-61.

Rosenholtz, S. 1989. *Teachers' workplace: The social organization of schools.* White Plains, NY: Longman.

Sarason, S. (1971). The Culture of the School and the Problem of Change. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Shane, Harold. "Educated Foresight for the 1990's." *Educational Leadership.* 47.1 (September, 1989): 4.

Appendix A

Questionnaire

Principal Questions

Intro: We're interviewing staff in schools that have received 2020 grants in order to explore how people behave in schools that are working on restructuring.

There are no right or wrong answers to these questions.

We can promise you complete confidentiality and anonymity. We will not share your answers with anyone else in the school or elsewhere, and when we write up our research, we will report information in a way that makes it impossible to identify individuals or schools.

When we finish, there'll give you time to as me any questions you have about the research.

School:

Date:

Person Interviewed:

1. Advocates for school restructuring argue that the decision-making process may change and that teachers will be more involved in goal setting, resource allocation, and so on. Can you think of any specific examples of this happening at your school? In general would you say that the decision-making process has changed over the past 3-5 years?

2. You mentioned some changes... Over what period did they occur? Why do you think they occurred?

3. Are there other things that happened here, before the school received the 2020 grant, that helped you get ready for these changes?

4. How do YOU exercise power and influence in the school?

4a. Would you say the way you exercise power and influence has changed over the past few years?

4b. Specifically, what kinds of things do YOU do to help make the 2020 process work?

4c. Can you describe any changes in the staff's behavior that you can attribute to the presence of the 2020 grant?

5. How does the 2020 site committee function in your school?

5a. Are there other important 2020 committees?

5b. What do these commitees do that is different from before?

6. Is the staff developing a shared vision for the school?

6a. What is it?

6b. Would you say that it has come out of the 2020 process? How?

7. Has this vision influenced your own behavior? How?

8. Advocates for school restructuring believe that teachers will need the types of information administrators ususally have but teachers usually don't? Have you made changes so they can get and use new information.

9. Have the resources available through the 2020 grant helped you achieve your goals as an educator?

Can you elaborate?

10. Do you think that, because of the 2020 process and other changes over time, the staff perceive you as less central or powerful in the school? Have there been changes in your role? Are there things you don't do any more? do less of? or more of?

Team Member Questions

1. Advocates for school restructuring argue that the decision-making process may change and that teachers will be more involved in goal setting, resource allocation, and so on. Can you think of any specific examples of this happening at your school? In general would you say that the decision-making process has changed over the past 3-5 years?

2. You mentioned some changes... Over what period did they occur? Why do you think they occurred?

3. Are there other things that happened here, before the school received the 2020 grant, that helped you get ready for these changes?

4. How do YOU influence others in the school?

4a. Specifically, what kinds of things do you do to help make the 2020 process work?

4b. Can you describe any changes in your colleagues' behavior that you can attribute to the presence of the 2020 grant?

4c. Can you describe any changes in your principal's behavior that you can attribute to the presence of the 2020 grant?

Probe: Would you say that there have been changes in the way the principal has exercised influence or made decisions as a result of the 2020 process?

5. How does the 2020 site committee function in your school?

5a. Are there other important 2020 committees?

5b. What do these commitees do that is different from before?

6. Is the staff developing a shared vision for the school?

6a. What is it?

6b. Would you say that it has come out of the 2020 process? How?

7. Has this vision influenced your own behavior? How?

8. Advocates for school restructuring believe that teachers will need the types of information administrators usually have but teachers usually don't? Have you been able to get this kind of information? How? Elaborate?

9. Have the resources available through the 2020 grant helped you achieve your goals as an educator?

   Can you elaborate?

10. Do you think that, because of the 2020 process and other changes over time, that you and the other staff perceive the principal as less central or powerful in the school? Have there been changes in his/her role? Are there things the principal doesn't don't do any more? does less of? or more of?